



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,330

06/06/2007

Manfred Hartmann

741438-69

3344

78198

7590

09/24/2009

Studebaker & Brackett PC
1890 Preston White Drive
Suite 105
Reston, VA 20191

EXAMINER

ROY, SIKHA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/24/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/594,330	Applicant(s) HARTMANN, MANFRED	
	Examiner Sikha Roy	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/29/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b) the specification should include following sections, each one with proper section headings such as 'Title of the Invention', 'Background of the Invention', 'Summary of the Invention', 'Brief Description of Drawing', 'Detailed Description of the Invention', 'Claims' and 'Abstract'.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

Claim2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2 'the electrode layer' should be -- transparent electrode layer--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

Art Unit: 2879

regards as the invention. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the single supporting layer" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 2,922,076 to Sack et al. and further in view of USPN 3,890,039 to Cantarano.

Regarding claim 1 Sack discloses (Figs. 1, 3 col. 2 lines 26-72, col. 3 lines 40-75) an electroluminescent display having an at least partially transparent carrier (support member) 20, a transparent electrode layer 22 situated on the carrier 20, a luminescent layer 24 containing electroluminophores which represents image area, a rear electrode 26 in a region of majority of the image area, an insulating layer 28 which has recess 30 in the region of the rear electrode 26, contact layer 30 situated on at least a part of the area of the insulating layer 28 for contacting the rear electrode.

Sack discloses the contact made of electrically conductive varnish but does not expressly disclose the contact layer to be transparent.

Cantarano in pertinent art discloses (col. 4 lines 22-27) the use of high conductive transparent varnish (NESA). It has been held to be within the general skill of

Art Unit: 2879

a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to have transparent conductive varnish as contact layer of Sack, since the selection of known materials for a known purpose is within the skill of the art.

Regarding claim 2 Sack discloses the transparent electrode made of transparent conductive material. Catarano discloses the use of conductive transparent varnish (NESA) for transparent electrode. It has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to have transparent electrode made of transparent conductive varnish, since the selection of known materials for a known purpose is within the skill of the art.

Regarding claim 3 Sack and Catarano disclose the contact layer is made of transparent conductive varnish.

Regarding claim 4 Sack discloses the insulating layer 28 is made of transparent glass.

Regarding claim 5 Sack discloses the display having a rear insulating layer 32.

Regarding claim 6 Sack discloses (col. 3 line 71 through col. 4 line 2) the insulating layer 32 is made of barium titanate which is known to be transparent dielectric material (as evidenced by USPN 5,069,815 to Aoki et al. col. 4 lines 50-55).

Regarding claims 7 and 8 Sack discloses the carrier consists of glass.

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 9 Sack discloses the contact layer is contacted using its own busbar 36.

Regarding claim 10 Sack discloses (col. 4 lines 30-40) the busbar is made of silver.

Regarding claims 11, 12 and 14 Sack discloses (col. 2 lines 69-71, col. 3 lines 33-46) the image area is divided into multiple non-coherent partial image areas according to different back electrodes, bus bars (an electroluminescent layer with elemental back electrode forming a single light producing element) where each area can be activated individually or in groups (plurality of light producing elements).

Regarding claim 13 Sack discloses the contact layer 30 contacts the rear electrode layer directly in the region of the recess.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USPN 5,410,217 to LaPointe, USPN 6,965,196 to Murasco et al. and USPN 7,088,039 to Barnardo et al. disclose electroluminescent displays with multiple illuminated display areas.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sikha Roy/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879